8/18/72

Mr. Carl Bernstein
News Room
The Washington Post
1150 15 St., NW
Washington, D.C. 20005

NOT SENT

Dear Mr. Bernstein,

Tuesday you asked me to "keep those memos coming". There have been others - have not sent the Post because Bob Woodward never responded to any. There is nothing in this for me except the waste of time for which I am not compensated, aside for what gratification there may be in doing a worthwhile public service. I took silence to mean indifference. Moreover, I regard cooperation as two-way. The one thing I asked Bob to follow, the Hunt-Liittauer & Wilkinson connection, he said led nowehere. That isn't possible and I have been able to carry it further without leaving home, from standard sources consulted by a friend for me, and by a single phone call. My interest is this was pretty explicit.

So, while I can't now take time to go through the by-now large file for the memos I didn't send, and I don't think I can now recall which I did and which I didn't, you are still welcome to them. I'm doing this note while awaiting the coming of today's mail, which will force me to suspend. I'm writing you on tissue because the few comments I will make will be more for friends with whom I work than for you. At least some of it will have been obvious to you, but few of the friends who have background data on this are reporters.

I recognize the limitations imposed on reporters by space and accepted practise, but I can also remember my own reporting days and my own asking of questions to get another point of view or another source acceptable for quotation. Thus I find myself wondering about your today's joint story and the questions not asked. MacGregor was not the only "authority" who could have been questioned and some of his "explanations" are both inplausible and already refuted by the GAO.

For Liddy and any of that other motley crew to be spending money to determine how radicals might disrupt the Miami Dullsville is like having a pimp investigate prostitution. Perhaps it would be more apt to say to put a pimp at guarding the harem. These are the most extreme radcials themselves, even in Republican ranks. And that kind of operation requires the amount of money already accounted or this extreme indirection in his handling and hiding? The function alleged would be legitimate if true and need not be hidden.

But what the hell, may I ask, has the Secret Service and the FBI been doing, or why wasn't MacGregor asked this or the qualifications of Liddy andhis crew to do that job?

What kind of ex poste facto explanation can Stans make with the filings already made not showing these funds or their expenditures? The claim that duplicates Dahlburg's impropriety, the unaccounted claim to myriads of small sums, plus the claim that they are in the other claim I find incredible, that so many small and unlisted contributions were made. Nixon ain't exactly McGovern with this pull to the less affluent.

One of the nastier direct quotes is that linking McGovern to Hitler when all these GOP boyos are themselves Hitler types. There were concentration camps under Hunt and Barker (see The Bay of Pigs), and for comrades who received no "trial" at all. These are all practising fascists who are "investigating" what Mac Gregor without being questioned calls "radicals".

Where people are unwilling to be questioned in person, it is not an uncommon practise to send questions in writing. From an AP story of the 10th, "MacGregar said that from his own investigation,, he is satisfied that the $25,000 check was cashed by Bernard Barker and the proceeds turned over to the campaign treasury." Nobody thought to ask why Dahlburg in Florida should gather smaller sums totalling $25,000, give them to the proper official, Stans, who did not either deposit the check or cash it but instead permitted it to return to Florida, to a non-Republican official, who put it in his own account, drew against it, only to turn the proceeds over to the campaign treasury? Especially when a cat with this background is a) caught in a serious crime and a political crime and with more than $5,00o

on him and b) with one Republican employee at least also arrested and immediate links to others and to the White House itself. Yet this was said at the National Press Club, where one would ordinarily expect the toughest questions to be asked.

MacGregor shouldn't have been asked if this breakin was part of that study of radicals if that is the new alleged purpose of the funds and inherently the operation?

Other omissions in the reporting also trouble me. One is the undeviating reporting of the caper as simply no more than "bugging", which is bad enough, when every reporter knows that doesn't require five men and cameras and walkie-talkies, etc.

Another is the failure to get and use pictures of Hunt, which should be available as one of my earlier memos shows from countless dust jackets, from Brown classbook and alumni news, among the more obvious places. Use would include showing to Bay of Pigs vets i f not publication. But publication itself couldlead to more information.

In consecutive grafs of this AP story MacGregor is quoted as having made his own investigation, treated as the real and complete McCoy, and as knowing nothing of the $89,000. Having without question been reported as having conducted an investigation, still without question he is quoted in refusing to comment on the $89,000,"I haven't had an opportunity to investigate the facts." Can both be true, both be reported without questioning?

On even the accounting of that $25,000, already reported by the GAO as not accounted for, his evasion is quoted, the word "assessment" being verbosity:""MacGregor predicted the GAO's current investigation would confirm the 'assessment of facts I have given here today'." I.e., that all this international transferring of money was for the sole purpose of Barker's turning it over to the "campaign treasury". If the GAO has to make an "assessment" to begin with, can there be proper records?

This is not standard political press treatment. Comparison with handling of McGovern matters of the recent past should indicate this. If I don't impugn anyone's motives and have no reason to, I do find myself wondering why, with all the available unchecked leads on what by even Republican admissions is a major story so many remained unchecked. Even in Washington. I can't see what makes Nixon so sacred when FDR could be clobbered, albeit falsely, over Fala, and Ike could over his free stock and tractors, etc.